points for food and equipment needed for construction, housing for lock tenders and mule drivers, stabling for mules, transshipment points for marketable farm products, access points for passengers for coastal packets, the locations of marine supply stores for canal shipping, and support facilites for canal maintenance crews. It is expected that at least some of these features could be recovered archaeologically, although later canal widening and other improvements may have obliterated the sites.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND BACKGROUND RESEARCH

The primary goal of the Phase I survey was the simple location and identification of cultural resources within the Proposed Right-of-Way. Therefore, it is difficult to link the Phase I survey with an explicit research design. However, it is possible to apply some of the general and specific predictive models for the location of prehistoric sites in Delaware's High Coastal Plain. The potential site locations identified by these models can then be the focus of more intensive fieldwork.

Based on numerous studies of prehistoric site distributions in Delaware's High Coastal Plain (Custer 1984; Custer, Bachman, and Grettler 1987; Custer and DeSantis 1986), the areas adjacent to major drainages are the focus of the most intensive and extensive prehistoric settlement. Because there are no such settings in the current study area, large base camp sites are expected to occur only rarely in the Project Area. Nonetheless, the Project Area does cross numerous smaller drainages and these settings may be the locations of prehistoric sites, including

small base camps and procurement sites. Some low order ephemeral drainages with associated springheads and poorly drained interior settings may also be the location of transient camps and procurement sites. Generally, settlement along the major drainages is expected for all time periods. Use of interior locales is most likely during Woodland I times. Figure 4 shows the anticipated locations of prehistoric sites based on general predictive models and the more specific LANDSAT-based model.

Prior to and during the Phase I survey, previous archaeological planning studies (Custer, Jehle, Klatka, and Eveleigh 1984; Custer and Bachman 1986; Custer, Bachman, and Grettler 1986, 1987) were consulted to ascertain the presence of known archaeological cultural resources within the Proposed Right-of-Way. Historic maps and atlases (Penn Warrants and Surveys, various years; 1737 Map drawn by Eastburn, Figure 5; Rea and Price 1849, Figure 6; Pomeroy and Beers 1868, Figure 7; Baist 1893, Figure 8; Bausman 1941, Figure 9; and the USGS Topographic Survey (1953) 1970, Figure 10) were consulted for the locations of former standing structures which have now become archaeological sites. Current landowners and tenants were queried regarding any observations they may have made about cultural resources on their property. From these sources, possible locations of prehistoric and historic cultural resources were plotted and examined during the survey.

FIELD AND LAB METHODS

The Phase I archaeological field methods included a mixture of pedestrian survey and shovel test pits within and immediately